

### Remarks

The Examiner rejected claims 2-3 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In support of the rejection, the Examiner noted that the reference to the "hand of the user" in lines 4-5 of claim 2 lacked antecedent basis. Reconsideration is requested.

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 6 to provide antecedent base for "hand of the user." Consequently, the Section 112, second paragraph, rejection of claims 2 and 3, which depend from claim 1, has been overcome.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,462,018 in the name of Louison. Reconsideration is requested.

As defined in independent claim 1, Applicant's hair styling brush comprises bristles extending from a curved, perforated body. The bristles in Louison are supported on a disk expressly recited in the patent as "imperforate." See column 3, lines 8-10. Accordingly, Louison does not anticipate claim 1, or claims 4 and 5 that depend from claim 1. Withdrawal of the Section 102 (b) rejection is requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Louison in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,435,327 in the name of Ho. Reconsideration is requested.

Applicant's claim 2 recites that the blower assembly is in a blower housing with exhaust holes positioned to direct air flow from the blower assembly *toward the handle so that the exhaust air will contact the hand of the user*. As stated by the Examiner, Louison does not show this feature.

Ho shows an exhaust opening, but it is not directed toward the handle. Rather, it is directed back at the bristles. See the orifice 21 in Figures 1 and 2, and the openings 110 and


121 in Figures 3-4. Indeed, it is an express objective of Ho to draw loose hairs and dandruff from the hair and blow air onto the hair at the same time. See Ho at column 3, lines 6-11. While Ho may suggest exhaust holes generally, it certainly does not suggest the arrangement recited in Applicant's claim 2, where the exhaust is directed at the user's hand, not at the hair being styled.

Accordingly, claim 2 is patentable over Louison and Ho, whether considered separately or in combination. Since claim 3 depends from claim 2, claim 3 likewise is patentable.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-7 are patentable over the references of record. A notice of allowance is requested.

This is intended to be a complete response to the Office action of January 19, 2005.

Respectfully Submitted,



Mary M. Lee, Reg. No. 31,976  
Customer No. 23547  
1300 E. 9<sup>th</sup> Street, No. 4  
Edmond, OK 73034-5760  
Tel. No.: (405) 285-4490  
Fax No.: (405) 285-4491  
Email: [mmml@marymlee.com](mailto:mmml@marymlee.com)  
Attorney for Applicant